

was reformed. He might say, "My drunkenness did not disqualify me from judging correctly, for I have judged, and am reformed." The man who takes a little at weddings, to save mortifying his pride by refusing, is *masked*, is deceived by it. He has the appearance of evil.

Dr. Beman did not think there could be so much debate as there had been on this resolution, but he rejoiced in it, for when the convention so unanimously passed the resolution condemning all intoxicating liquors, he felt alarmed, for he thought this apparent unanimity in so extensive an assembly, could not be as deep and settled as is necessary for practical temperance purposes. And therefore he rejoiced that now we were to find out how far individuals intended to go in carrying out that vote into the practical details. For his part, he could not regard it as an objection to the present resolution, that it "hits" anybody, as his venerable brother from Ohio (Dr. Beecher) had urged. That brother, whom he loved and honored, had published what he might call the *pioneer* sermons of the temperance cause. Did they not "hit"? It hit every body. It was by such grand hits, repeated and followed up, such as none know better how to give than he, that the cause was built up. And I say, said Dr. Beman, the more such hits we have the better. I rejoice in their recent conversions, and I have no doubt our brethren themselves have been somewhat affected by the circumstance that they received more "hits" than they liked, while they continued to drink their wine and beer and cider.

My brother said we must march all together. I like the figure. I am glad he said "march," and I hope we will not stand still with any body. Let us keep marching. It is a good word for one who goes forth to do good among mankind, "keep marching." I do not believe any of our men will skulk behind, because we go forward. I have heard this same prophecy of evil ever since the cause began, but it never came to pass. When we commenced, people said, "You must not call good old Jamaica spirit poison, if you do, it will offend such a man, a good temperance man, who buys and sells rum." But we hit them, and hit them hard, and we reformed them. And so it will be again. I do not say that this hits any body here, but there are ministers who take a little at weddings, and they "come under the influence." I do not say how much, but just so far as they do, they are deceived by this mocker. The resolution holds true on two grounds.—One is the ground of self-indulgence. No man is well qualified to judge of a habit to which he is attached. Is a man with a bribe in his hand impartial? Suppose he is not at all intoxicated, or under the intoxicating influence of what he drinks, yet if he submits to the habit, he is not impartial. In the same degree as he loves his cherished habit, he is disqualified.—And no habit is naturally so loved, as the habit of exhilaration.

But there is another ground. Only the real temperance men, who have rowed up to high water mark, are capable of judging of both sides, for only they have tried both sides. Sir, if we would advance in this cause, we must swim up stream, and show that we are live fishes, not dead ones. If I had a case for a jury, that turned on a question involving the temperance principle, I would insist that the juryman should be kept three months from all intoxicating liquors and drink only pure cold water.

Alvan Stewart was satisfied that this timid spirit, this appalling ghost of ultraism, which had so long stood before men of high standing in the temperance ranks, had been the cause of all our misfortunes. It made our leaders set so low a mark in the outset, that hundreds, yea thousands had been deceived by it and destroyed.—Had the original founders of the Temperance Society marked high, and taken this only true ground at first, of abstinence from all that can intoxicate, should we have witnessed these melancholy defections? As the case was, every step that we have advanced has been in the face of this stale charge of ultraism. Every pursuing out of the question to its consequences, that has been successively grafted into the cause, has been carried in the face of this cry. And when I hear this charge from men who stand high in the ranks of temperance, and whose words fall from a height and sink deep, I am alarmed.—Sir, the ground we now occupy was marked out by men who were then called *ultraists*. That noble band of ultraists stood forth as the fuglemen of this noble cause, while your men of high standing, close belted, calculating, and wily, stood back, saying, "It will be time enough for me to come in with my weight of character, when they have broken the ground."—Whereas, if these men had taken the right ground at first, I have no doubt that thousands who are now tottering on the brink of perdition might have been saved. Sir, I would rather occupy the position of an *ultraist* than the position of these men.—No doubt the Savior was considered an *ultraist* by the scribes and pharisees. The apostles were *ultraists*. Luther and Calvin were *ultraists*. And so have all those great and good men been considered, who have gone in advance of their generation, in holding up truth for the reformation of mankind. All these tall landmarks of generations have been in their turn marks for the scorn.

Sir, why should we try to shear round this truth because it is not popular. None of our doctrines are popular, in fact; our cause has always been in the minority.—We have never yet been able to carry the whole church with us on any one point; and yet we are complimenting ourselves on these points. I hope we shall act cautiously, but firmly, as becomes those who hold the destinies of their fellow men in their hands. Had all come up at first

and stood shoulder to shoulder on this ground, our cause would now have stood at a point, which, I sometimes fear, it will now never reach.

Dr. Beecher complained of this throwing out of invidious remarks. I do know, said he, and the worthy secretary of the society will bear me witness, that if we had come out in full at first and avowed the opinions we now do, we should have been driven back. Public opinion would not have borne it. Because a man goes before the community in any thing, he is not of course an *ultraist*. All great men and reformers do this of course. But because a man goes ahead of the community, neither does it follow that he is a great man and a reformer. It is confounding things to suppose that zeal without knowledge, or driving on without discretion, is the way to do good. Some people seem to talk as if zeal and driving on was every thing. The way the Temperance cause has been gained was to take one point first, where we could hold, and stand the re till we could rally the community around us to support us, and then take another. The reason we took this course was not that we wanted the popular voice to cheer up our cowardice, or to secure our fame.—We were not afraid, nor were we seeking fame; but it was wisely judging that this was the best way for the good of the cause. The wisdom of Heaven was manifest in the manner in which this cause, so difficult and so important, was begun and has been carried on, without even faltering or being driven back, and almost without a mistake. Gentlemen ought not to throw out these invidious remarks against those who differ from them.

A. Stewart. The word *ultraism* was used by the gentleman himself, in an invidious sense, with direct reference to the speakers who had gone before him. And so was the charge of driving on, with zeal without discretion. I meant nothing more personal than that remark.

Mr. John Tappan moved to recommit the resolution to the committee. There was some difficulty in the phraseology;—and he thought they might present it in a form that all would approve.

Rev. H. C. Wright, of Boston, was in favor of the resolution. It reports progress in the cause. It makes an advance, it says that wine and cider, and beer, are deceivers, and that those who are influenced by them are less likely to form a true judgment on the subject of temperance.

Mr. J. Tappan was prepared to vote for the original resolution, if called to vote now, though he thought it might be better expressed. It is an alarming fact, that wine-drinking is increasing in this country to an unprecedented extent. Never was so much drunk at our hotels, and the wine-drinkers seem to set the Temperance Society at defiance. Unless we use language as strong, at least, and unequivocal, as the resolution, the temperance cause will roll back. He hoped strong but kind resolutions would be passed, and passed unanimously, calculated to awaken public attention to this subject, and to stem the torrent of wine and beer-drinking, that now rises high, and threatens to sweep away all our works.

From the Christian Watchman.

#### ROBERTS FUND SOCIETY.

For two or three months past, our exchange journals have contained frequent notices of the above named Society, and especially of its founder, the Rev. Issachar J. Roberts. Until recently we made no record of these transactions, because we were not sufficiently informed upon the subject, either to approve or disapprove of them. Mr. Roberts has recently visited this city, for the purpose of negotiating a connection of the "Roberts Fund Society" with the Baptist General Convention. At a special meeting of the Board, called expressly for this object and numerously attended, there being present by special request members from Providence, New-York city, Philadelphia, &c., the request of Mr. Roberts was duly considered; and after a candid and patient examination of the principles on which the "Roberts Fund Society" is founded, the Board unanimously declined the proposition of Mr. Roberts, and in consequence of the peculiarity of the principles on which it is founded, have refused all connection with that Society.

The object of the Society is thus expressed in the following, which is the second Article in the constitution:

"Art. 2. Its sole object shall be, 1. to transact the business of a permanent fund created in the Mississippi Valley, by Elder Issachar J. Roberts, Missionary to China, together with the management of any other funds collected and paid over for the purpose of the society. 2. By every proper and laudable effort, both in the Mississippi Valley and Asia, to improve the moral and religious condition of the inhabitants of China, and the adjacent nations that write, read or speak the Chinese language."

Upon the 2d clause of this article of the constitution, Mr. Roberts has made in a communication recently published in the New-York Evangelist, the following comments, which cast additional light upon the objects of the society, and upon its present movements:

"According to the 2d clause of the second article of this constitution, this society aims at a concentrating the united efforts of the whole Mississippi Valley, and bringing them to bear in the mighty work of improving the moral and religious condition of the numerous inhabitants of China. That nation alone is taken up, but all the various operations necessary for the perfection of that work are taken into consideration; consequently arrangements are made and regulations adopted for the education of pious youths and ministers for that field especially; for sending them

out and supporting them in the capacity of preachers, teachers, printers, physicians, distributors of Bibles, tracts, or any other capacity in which they can promote the work; for publishing Bibles, tracts, and the circulation of information at home in relation to that mission.

The Board of Directors for the advancement of this work have a "Standing Helping Committee" in each state and territory of the Valley. These will examine and recommend candidates, either for an education preparatory to the China Mission, or for immediate labor in that field. These committees will sustain much of the responsibility in their reception and will naturally take a deep interest in providing for their support.

The Board have already entered upon this mighty work. More than one hundred and fifty of the first talents of the denomination in the Valley are already appointed as coadjutors in this work, and are either life directors, legal directors, or ex-officio directors of the society. They are well chosen and spread out from the gulph of Mexico to Lake Michigan; and from the Alleghany mountains to the western boundary of Missouri. This company of brethren form an overwhelming phalanx whose concentrated powers will be mighty through God to the pulling down of the strong holds of darkness in China!

One missionary, the undersigned, is already received under the patronage of this society. Two young men are also received under its patronage to be educated, and one or two others are now in readiness to accompany him as missionaries to China. But the society has not the means at present of educating those or sending these. And, consequently, the Board have authorized the undersigned to raise funds, by donations, or otherwise, from any who may esteem it a privilege to co-operate in this work."

From the above it appears that the aims of the society are far from being small;—and that its end is a desirable one. We most fully approve of the end here specified. It remains, however, for us to examine some of the means proposed for its attainment.

The first clause of this second article in the Constitution, declares it to be the object of the society in part, "to transact the business of a permanent fund, created in the Mississippi Valley, by Elder Issachar J. Roberts, together with the management of any other funds, collected and paid over to the purposes of the society." This first clause of the second article should be explained. The amount of this fund should be known; and the method of creating it should be stated. It should be known, also, who is to control this fund—whether the Board of the Society are to control it, or whether they merely act as the legally constituted trustees of Mr. Roberts, subject to his order. Should no explanation be given upon these and some other points, persons who may hereafter become acquainted with the facts relative to this matter, may rightfully accuse Mr. Roberts and his friends of having practised on them one of the grossest of impositions; whereas we cannot suppose that either Mr. Roberts or his friends cherish any other than the most upright intentions in their present movements. Let, then, their whole plan be developed, and if individuals prefer this new and extraordinary organization, let them make the election.

Mr. Roberts is represented as having given his whole estate, amounting to thirty thousand dollars, and himself to the mission; and the impression received is, that this Board of Missions is constituted on the same principles as other Boards of Missions; and that Mr. Roberts has committed himself to the guidance and good faith of that Board—that while he obeys the instructions of his Board, he may rely upon them for a maintenance and a support of the mission. But the facts, as we understand them, are far otherwise—he has neither given himself nor his funds.

Mr. Roberts, some few years since, entered in the state of Mississippi, one thousand acres of government land, for which he paid about thirty hundred dollars.—This land he now possesses, and it constitutes his whole estate, estimated by himself to be worth something like \$30,000. This property he has placed in the hands of legally constituted trustees, with instructions not to sell the land until it will bring \$30,000. When sold the avails are to be invested, and kept invested in the most productive form, both principal and interest, until the whole amounts to \$100,000, when the interest only may be expended.

Mr. Roberts has a mother, three brothers and five sisters, whom his trustees are instructed to support without regard to cost. In the mean time, Mr. Roberts is to be supported, and the various expenses of the mission to China met, by moneys hired or contributed, as the case may be. It is expected that large sums will be contributed for this object. The instructions of Mr. R. already given to his trustees for various objects in this country and in China, amount, we understand, to \$140,000. All moneys to be collected for the "Roberts Fund Society," as well as the funds already in the hands of his trustees, are to be subject to the absolute control of Mr. Roberts. Hence, so far from having given anything, Mr. Roberts has exchanged a lot of land estimated by himself to be worth only thirty thousand dollars, for his own support of life, the maintenance of a numerous family connection, and at least one hundred and forty thousand dollars, of which he is to have the disposal. Now we should think that a right shrewd speculator might call this a pretty fair bargain.

Mr. Roberts has already travelled extensively in different states, forming Auxiliary Societies, and taking up collections. In the last number of the New-York Evangelist we noticed an acknowledgment of money collected by him in different places, in the District of Columbia,

Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New-Jersey. Among the items we noticed \$8,60 contributed by the German Reformed Church in Chambersburg, Pa., to be paid over to Elder CHARLES GUTZLAFF.

It must be perceived that there are many things in this new organization quite new and extraordinary; and to most of these peculiarities we have serious objections. There are very weighty objections to the investment of large permanent funds in institutions of this kind in any form; and especially, to an unproductive, or accumulative fund.

We object to giving these extraordinary powers to a missionary. Ordinarily the missionary places himself under the direction of the Board. But in this instance, the Board are under the control of their missionary, he having the power to reverse their every act not made in conformity to his order.

Why is there any necessity, it is natural to inquire, for any new organization for the establishment of a mission in China? Why did not Mr. Roberts place himself under the patronage of the Board of the General Convention? If he wished to give his property for the benefit of the mission, that Board could have taken charge of it, and would have appropriated it agreeably to his wishes; or if he wished to provide for his family he might have done so.

## THE TELEGRAPH.

AUGUST 25.

For the Telegraph.

### TEE-TOTALISM—the Wine Question.

Mr. Editor:

The remarks which follow are designed rather as a continuation of the article I sent you previous to your late absence, than as a set reply to the notes you were pleased to append to that communication. If I am "in the dark" as to the meaning of the word "tee-total," as it is very possible I may be, not having been so successful as to find it in any dictionary at hand, or among the 80,000 words of Dr. Webster, as the word has something of a heathenish look, I hope you will favor your readers and me with the origin, definition, and force of the term—whether it means abstinence from all that intoxicates the human brain, or only alcohol, in the various modes and forms in which it is known to exist; for if I rightly divine there is an alcoholic, an intoxicating, demoralizing, soul-debasing principle, in some other things besides strong drink.

In both my former and present remarks my object has been to take a Bible view of the subject. In my connexion with the Christian church, I am pledged to the Scriptures as my only rule of faith and practice, and I have found it necessary to "stop and solemnly to pause," not that I was in darkness at all, but to inquire how far I ought, and might innocently, descend from my high vocation, to listen to authorities and requirements for which I could find (although they were not expressly forbidden) no warrant in the statistics of my King and country. My inquiries were such as these: Does the Word of God require me to reject as forbidden fruit the fermentation of the apple and the grape? Does the church of God require it of me? Does the voice of *natural conscience*, heaven's silent monitor in man, require it?—There is nothing," sir, "like taking hold of the conscience," and nothing like the Bible to affect this. Before I can leave sinning I must repent of sin; and before I can repent of sin I must be shown that I do sin. And will you attempt this by citing me to what every modern novice in ethics may say? or will you reinstate the "law and the testimony," and show me that if I act or walk not according to these it is because I am "in darkness," and there is no light nor life in me?

When, eighteen years since, I connected with the church, I was by that act pledged to be "temperate in all things," to "use this world as not abusing it." Why, then, I repeat, should I come down from the high ground I then assumed, to pledge myself anew to every self-created, self-responsible, merely human association, which, in the ever-varying aspect of human affairs, might chance to arise; as if the pledge I then gave to God and all good men, had proved insufficient to hold me to the performance of the duties that that pledge involved? Ah, sir, here if I mistake not, is an anti-climax in Christian morality, without a parallel in the longevity of the world!

The Scriptures you have, and which are generally quoted, I think, sir, are quite irrelevant. While the Bible everywhere allows the moderate use of wine, it also throughout every page, forbids its *intemperate* use; as it does likewise of all those personal pleasures and enjoyments which in their due and proper sphere are innocent, but which in their unrestrained indulgence become sinful; of which wine is so frequently used by the inspired writers as the appropriate and significant symbol.

By "excess" I mean the same that you yourself mean—*intemperance*, extravagance, inordinate use. Him who eats to excess, that is, immoderately, we call a *glutton*: him who sleeps to excess we denominate a *sluggard*; and a *drunkard* him who drinks to excess. And here, sir, just by the way, are you prepared to pledge yourself that you will neither eat nor sleep while the world stands, if by so doing you can reclaim and save the glutton and the sluggard? Your tee-totalism, or if you please, your temperance ultraism, carried in its principles fully out, will not, I think, permit you to stop short of this. He that will save his life shall lose it.

Some thirty or forty years ago it was thought of some importance that church members should not be ignorant of the

moral and Christian qualifications requisite to a becoming participation of the Lord's Supper. But now in this enlightened and pious age, we hear more about the quality of the wine to be used at that sacred feast, than we do about the qualities of those who are to be the guests. If here is not discoverable the "mint, annise and cummin," I know not where the rebuke of our Lord can fall. I think I do not exaggerate when I affirm, that for fifteen or twenty years past, I have scarcely heard one word from the pulpit either before, at, or subsequently to the celebration of the communion as to what is requisite in character to a worthy participating of the same. Instead of this, all at once, the spell is dissolved, and we are astounded with the truly important information that the wine which has been in use is not wine, but something else imposed on us under that name, and the churches (vastly kind) are advertised where they can obtain the pure blood of the grape. A imports it, B and C receive it of him, and it passes through all the letters of the alphabet, till at last the churches receive the "genuine article." Ah, sir, if here is not something that smells of "the root of all evil," my olfactory nerves have become diseased, and I can no longer trust to the decision of my own senses. Several sorts of wine were common among the Jews. Which of these did our Savior elect?—Was it mixed wine, or pure? fermented, or unfermented? And the bread the Lord brake to his disciples, was it coarse or fine? of wheat or of some other grain? Can you tell?

We have in all our principal towns and villages men of sedentary lives, sinecures, whose greatest mental effort seems to be how they shall lighten the burden of time, which hangs heavily upon their hands.—These tenants of the shade tell the noble spirited, intelligent, independent yeomanry, the lords of creation, what they may drink and what they may not drink, or the fruit of their own hands, when they come from their labor in the field! Let these downy recluses learn from actual experience what the labor of the operative classes is, before they further dictate to them what their fare shall be. My soul has become sick of hearing these theories, abstract men, calling on the effective classes of society, to be and to do what they themselves can neither do nor be, for sheer love of ease. It savors too much of the spirit of slavery and aristocracy. I cannot away with it.

I am a friend to discussion—to open, free, full discussion. My regret has been, and still must be, that a subject so intensely interesting and significant as that of the Christian passover, should have been degraded to the level of ordinary, secular subjects, in being admitted for discussion, by secular men, into the secular, ordinary, half-penny ephemerals of the day.

I subscribe myself not "*Radix*," as it was printed under my former communication, but

RADICUS.

REMARKS.

The necessity of placing the above in the hands of the compositor previously to reviewing it, has rendered it inconvenient to append these remarks in the form of notes, which will consequently be less particular and less extended than they otherwise would have been. But the occasion is so abundant that we cannot refrain from saying a few things.

As to the origin of the word *tee-total*, it was given in a late number of the Telegraph. As to the meaning of it, we believe that "*Radix*" was the first among our correspondents to introduce it into the Telegraph, applying it to a Society which proposed to abstain from all intoxicating drinks. With the definition that would be drawn as a matter of course from such a use of the word, we are entirely satisfied. Thus our correspondent is left his own expositor, of which he ought not to complain, for if he has used a word without any definite meaning in his own mind, he will doubtless candidly fault himself and not others. In what "other things besides strong drink" our brother finds "an alcoholic principle," is above or beyond our knowledge. Touching the things that may be considered "intoxicating, demoralizing, soul-debasing," there would probably be very little disagreement between us.

We agree with Radicus that there is "nothing like the Bible," to take hold of the conscience. And he will agree with us that it is one thing to talk about the Bible and another thing to talk *Bible*.—There is a large class of men in this nation in the daily practice of a sin inconceivably more heinous than any one we would lay to the charge of Radicus, who labor very stoutly to defend their conduct from the Bible. We call our brother back to a point which he seems to have passed over.

We put the question and press it: does he feel at liberty to use as food, beverage or luxury, every article which is not expressly and in so many words forbidden in the Bible? If not, then his argument falls, it being based entirely on the excuse—so far as the Bible is concerned—that that volume nowhere forbids the use of the articles desired. If he feels the absence of a specific prohibition to be a sufficient warrant for indulgence, *ad libitum*, in whatever the appetite may learn to

crave, his principle will allow him very unenviable—not to say unchristian associations. He may not only have a part with dog-eaters, lizzard eaters, opium, tobacco and arsenic eaters, but he may lift his head high among whiskey and rum drinkers, among forgers and innumerable other felons; for none of these are called out by name, none of their chosen practices are named and expressly forbidden anywhere in the Bible. Take the arsenic eater, who uses the deadly drug *moderately*, as a luxury, every day. Where, my brother, is your prohibitory passage of Scripture, applying to his case? When you have pointed it out, we engage to point you to a passage equally applicable to the case of the alcohol drinker, whether the latter poison be taken in rum, wine or cider.

We suppose that Radicus will agree with us, that his questions, whether "the church of God" and "the voice of natural conscience" require him to abstain, are settled by the settlement of the previous and paramount question: "Does the Word of God require" it of him? Now we wish to ask our good brother why he joined a temperance society, (as he has informed us on the 118th page of the Telegraph that he is a member of such a society,) which it is taken for granted, prohibits the use of alcohol under the name of rum, brandy, whiskey, &c. Was he careful to go to the Bible as his guide in this matter? If so, let him now point out the passage which requires him to join such a society, and we will point him to the passage which requires him to join a society which prohibits the use of alcohol under other names, and compounded with other ingredients more grateful to his palate.

This brings us to the consideration of another point. Radicus advances the doctrine that it is sufficient for him to unite with the church—that there is then no need of his joining in any other association for accomplishing an object which it is the duty of a Christian to labor for.—Worse than this—and what it is painful to see—he seems to imagine himself, by virtue of his church-membership elevated on a pinnacle from which he looks down with prodigious contempt on such associations, as though condescending to join them would be letting himself down from becoming Christian dignity. How he came to step down so far as to attach himself to one of these societies, as before noticed, or how many downward steps he has taken in joining others, he has neglected to inform us.

If all church-members had always done their duty in the work of Christian benevolence, there might have been less occasion for other associations than the church. But the fact that they have not—the fact that the American church is now the hiding place, the strong tower of some of the most damning sins of the age, sufficiently justifies distinct organization for the removal of these sins. If it be asked why a church member should join a temperance society, we begin the answer by asking why a church member should join an anti-slavery society? The ready answer to these questions is, because the influence of the church sustains intemperance and slavery, and therefore no individual can cast the full weight of his influence on the right side until he in some way or other separates himself from the multitude; and as fast as individuals detach so much of their influence as is misdirected by the body, it is necessary for them to concentrate their forces, in order to success. The member of the church who loves a little of the "good creature" gravely asks why it is not sufficient that he holds good standing in the church, without uniting with any other association; the member of the church who apologizes for slavery, as well as the one who buys and sells and drives his own brethren in the church, asks the same question. Both are answered by every passage of Scripture which in letter or spirit require that we be not partakers in other men's sins.

Radicus talks about a *temperate* and an *intemperate* use; and we are happy that he undertakes a definition—happy, because that now he has made an effort we trust that he will be self-convinced of his own lameness. Now for the definition: "*Intemperance*, extravagant use, inordinate use" (!) But what, pray, is *extravagant*, *inordinate* use? Why, *intemperance*!! "As you were gentlemen!"—Again: "a drunkard him who drinks to excess"—the amount of which is, drunkenness! It is an up-stream business, my